

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action of 24 June, 2005. The Applicant offers the following remarks and also resubmits the Information Disclosure Statement previously filed on January 18, 2005 together with the fee of \$180 and cited reference copy.

Claims

The Examiner has rejected all pending claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-22, 25-31, 33 and 34. By this amendment claims 1 and 20 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-22, 25-31, 33 and 34 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15, 17-22, 25-31 ad 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Dymetman et al. (Intelligent Paper; in Electronic Publishing, Artistic Imaging, and Digital Typography). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has now removed Graf (US 5,631,984) as a cited referenced in rejecting the claims, but has reintroduced Dymetman. Therefore the Applicants have reintroduced previously deleted claim limitations that clearly distinguish over Dymetman.

The Applicants assert that none of the prior art references cited by the Examiner fairly suggest substantially simultaneous printing as defined in the presently amended claims. Further, substantially simultaneous printing represents a significant and non obvious technical improvement over the references cited by the Examiner.

Dymetman et al. (Intelligent Paper) teaches paper that is pre-printed in bulk form by an authorized producer with a coded layer of ink. The paper is then delivered to publishers who print a layer of conventional, visible ink: "*These sheets are produced by publishers, who buy apparently blank sheets of Intelligent Paper from an authorized producer. The publishers can mark them with conventional visible inks in any way they choose.*" (Page 394, lines 1 to 3.) The blank sheets include coded data in the form of cells, where each cell includes a page-id and localization information that uniquely defines the position of the cell within the page. (Dymetman, WO 99/50787, page 9, line 30 to page 10, line 1.) Dymetman then further teaches the use of a special pointer (502) to capture data from the cells and feed it to a computer (peripheral 4). (Dymetman, WO 99/50787, page 5, lines 7-18.)

However, Dymetman does not disclose how the page-ids on the pre-printed sheets are associated with a corresponding digital page in the computer network. Some form of manual association process is clearly needed. Otherwise, when the pointer of Dymetman reads a particular page-id, the computer will be unable to associate the page-id with a unique digital page.

Such Intelligent Paper as disclosed by Dymetman that requires manual association between a *page-id* and visible graphic data printed on the page is very different from the Netpages disclosed in the present application. Rather than requiring such manual association, the present invention enables an automatic association between coded data including an identity of a page and graphic data printed on the page. Such automatic association is possible because the same printer prints both the coded data and the graphic data. As described above, such an automatic association between the spatial extent of the visible graphic data and the invisible coded data is now explicitly recited in the amended claims.

Support for the present claim amendments is found in the specification as originally filed at page 13, lines 11-17: “*The netpage consists of graphic data 2 printed using visible ink, and coded data 3 printed as a collection of tags 4 using invisible ink. The corresponding page description 5, stored on the netpage network, describes the individual elements of the netpage. In particular it describes the type and spatial extent (zone) of each interactive element (i.e. text field or button in the example), to allow the netpage system to correctly interpret input via the netpage. The submit button 6, for example, has a zone 7 which corresponds to the spatial extent of the corresponding graphic 8.*”

Thus it is clear that according to the present invention, at the time of printing the computer system associates the type and spatial extent of each reference point of the invisible coded data with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible graphic data.

The amendment to include “*printed substantially simultaneously thereon by a single printer*” is supported in the specification as originally filed at, for example, page 7, lines 12-18. “*The system and method also preferably employs specially designed printers to print the control devices... the printers are fully integrated into the network and allow for printing of the interactive forms on demand....*” and page 12, lines 26-31: “*In its preferred form, the netpage system relies on the production of, and human interaction with, netpages. These are pages of text, graphics and images printed on ordinary paper or other media, but which work like interactive web pages. Information is encoded on each page using ink which is substantially invisible to the unaided human eye. The ink, however, and thereby the coded data, can be sensed by an optically imaging pen and transmitted to the netpage system*” Then on page 14, lines 1-2, it states “*Netpages printed at their point of consumption combine the ease-of-use of paper with the timeliness and interactivity of an interactive medium.*”

Thus it is clear that according to the present invention a single netpage printer is used to print both the visible graphic data and the invisible coded data and that the printing of the visible graphic data and the invisible coded data is performed substantially simultaneously.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman and further in view of “Multicast or Bust” (Paul Boutin). The Applicants’ respectfully assert that the rejection is moot in light of the above described distinctions between the present claims and the disclosure of Dymetman.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762